

VZCZCXRO6907
PP RUEHAST RUEHDBU RUEHFL RUEHIK RUEHLA RUEHMR RUEHPOD RUEHROV RUEHSK
RUEHSR RUEHYG
DE RUEHVEN #0127/01 1381305
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 181305Z MAY 09
FM USMISSION USOSCE
TO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUCNOSC/ORG FOR SECURITY CO OP IN EUR COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUCNOSC/ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY IN EUROPE COLLECTIVE PRIORITY
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 6386
RUEHVEN/USMISSION USOSCE PRIORITY 0150

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 03 USOSCE 000127

SIPDIS

EUR, EUR/RPM

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [OSCE](#) [PGOV](#) [PREL](#)

SUBJECT: REDESIGNING EUROPE'S SECURITY ARCHITECTURE - IT'S ALL ABOUT MAKING RUSSIA FEEL COMFORTABLE AGAIN1.

SUMMARY. Most speakers agreed that the real value of the discussions on European security is in the process, not the outcome. The emphasis is on restoring trust among the participating States rather than any specific outcome. END SUMMARY

12. In an effort to help frame the evolving discussion on European Security Architecture, the Austrian Foreign Ministry hosted an expert meeting May 8 to consider various notions of security and look at specific concepts that have worked effectively in the past. The OSCE's Greek Chairmanship actively participated, seeing the meeting as an important step on the way to the June 27-28 Corfu informal Ministerial meeting. They dampened expectations for Corfu, or even the Athens Ministerial, and cautioned that this is only the start of what will probably be a marathon process.

- - - - -
INDIVISIBILITY OF SECURITY
- - - - -

13. The meeting's first session focused on the notion of "indivisibility of security", and how it relates to the discussions on European security. Dmitry Suslov, Deputy Director of the Council on Foreign and Defence Policy in Moscow, believes that the main challenge facing Europe today is Russia's role in the European security system. Suslov stated that there are different types of indivisible security, depending on whether it refers to security within an alliance (citing NATO's Article V, and CSTO commitments) or between security systems, where mutual vulnerability creates interdependence. This can be either negative, as during the Cold War, or positive, such as during the 1990s. The positive version doesn't just avoid confrontation, but actively seeks to increase security through cooperation. Power is shared equally, and none of the States makes a decision without first consulting the others. Wolfgang Zellner, Director of the Center for OSCE Research in Hamburg, agreed and noted that this type of positive cooperation exemplifies the concept of indivisible security as created by the Helsinki process in the early 1970s and confirmed in the 1990 Charter of Paris.

- - - - -
DIAGNOSIS OF THE CURRENT SITUATION
- - - - -

14. Adam Rotfeld, former Foreign Minister, now with the Polish Institute of International Affairs in Warsaw, confirmed the inclusiveness of the 1990 Charter adopted by all participating States, and believes it is up to Russia to decide if it wants to play by these rules, or go its own way. In his opinion, Russia is undermining the current system and also seeking changes. The two preferred Russian

"solutions" to the current crisis of European security - a return to the bipolar order of the late 20th century or the establishment of a new concert of power - are not viable and have no place in the 21st century. Andrei Zagorski, Leading Researcher at the Center for War and Peace Studies and the Moscow State Institute for International Relations, painted a slightly different picture. He explained that Russia has learned to hate many of the tremendous changes of the past 20 years, as they have meant a decrease in its strength and influence while that of the West has expanded. In Zagorski's opinion, the more NATO and the EU determine European security, the more marginalized Russia feels. Jacques AndrQani, President of the Association France-AmQriques in Paris, indirectly agreed with Zagorski's analysis. He argued that the root of the problem is political, not ideological. The current struggle is therefore about power and the ability to shape security.

15. Despite the political changes, speakers agreed on the continuing importance and validity of the OSCE's common values, principles and commitments. The problem is in how these commitments are implemented or enforced. The OSCE is not the cause of discord, but it feels the effects. Key norms like democracy and territorial integrity are being neglected or even openly violated. This has been accompanied by growing resentments on each side. In Zellner's view, European security has in the past 10 years been dominated by unilateral decisions by a number of participating States. This has poisoned the atmosphere and led to a dramatic loss of confidence and good will that will take years to overcome. Adding to the problem, there is currently a deadlock in international law, an irresolvable tension between various principles that has brought the participating States into

USOSCE 00000127 002 OF 003

conflict.

- - - - -
RECOMMENDATIONS
- - - - -

16. Panelists agreed there was a certain crisis of trust, due in part to failure to implement OSCE commitments. Michael Haltzel, Senior Fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University, stated that although trust was not a precondition for entering into a dialogue on European security, it was certainly a precondition for its success. In the absence of implementation of existing agreements, we have no confidence that future agreements will be respected. A Georgian representative therefore recommended approaching implementation of existing commitments - including the 6-point ceasefire and renewal of the OSCE mandate in Georgia - in parallel with discussions on European security in order to increase confidence and trust of the parties in the process.

17. The failure to implement commitments impacts not only on relations between States, but also on the situation within States. Violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms lead to instability within States, which can cause regional security problems. Many panelists noted the preeminent importance of arms control and conflict prevention and resolution for the future of European security. Several stated that resolution of the impasse on CFE is key to progress on European security.

18. In regard to the protracted conflicts, Oksana Antonenko, Senior Fellow at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, urged participants to think how to manage conflict long-term and prepare the ground for a comprehensive solution. She encouraged more focus on the hard security agenda to keep conflicts from escalating. Zagorski urged the OSCE participating States to look at what went wrong in Georgia and what we can do better. In order to avoid a repeat of August 2008, we need to strengthen the OSCE

and give it the means to take timely action to prevent conflict. He made a very unorthodox suggestion - from the Russian point of view - that the participating States create an urgent action mechanism that would give the OSCE the authority to take such preventive action even before consensus has matured. He acknowledged the difficulties inherent in agreeing upon such a mechanism derogating from the OSCE's strict consensus rule, but believes it would also be in Russia's long-term interest to have the OSCE - as opposed to NATO - be involved in conflict prevention in the wider European region.

¶9. What should the parameters of this process be? There was across the board agreement among panelists that European security discussions should build on the achievements of the past. Talks should include all three OSCE dimensions, and take the preservation of existing norms, principles and commitments as a point of departure. The OSCE should be the locus as it can be a forum for discussion as well as a tool for implementation. The vast majority of participating States think the OSCE is sound, useful and should continue to play a major role in European security.

¶10. Most speakers did not see the need for new security architecture per se, but acknowledged that it bodes poorly for European security if Russia is unhappy with the current system. There is a hope that through this process, States will be able to recreate a sense of trust, and that this increase in confidence will lead to improved cooperation and security in the region. Zagorski spoke of the need to return a feeling of ownership without compromising our achievements. The true value in the European security dialogue for the speakers seems therefore to lie in the process itself, rather than the outcome.

¶11. What does Russia want to gain from this process? According to Suslov, Russia wants the current discussions to lead to a restoration of bipolarity in Europe, with the U.S. and Russia as the poles. The Russian representative, when given an opportunity to ask questions, chose to focus on what he characterized as the West's double standards on territorial integrity in Kosovo and Georgia.

¶12. Comment: The main problem facing European security is political, not structural. Russia wants a seat at the table, to be bound into decision-making procedures and power-sharing

USOSCE 00000127 003 OF 003

in Europe. The Russian representative's only comments during the whole meeting focused on the unfairness of the West and the current security system, and did not touch on either the parameters or the goals of the European security discussions.
SCOTT